

Algerian decision to extradite him to Congo where he is under the sentence of death has aroused those of both liberal and conservative persuasions to protest this highhanded disregard for the rule of law. For instance, the Washington Post and New York Times in addition to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY of New York, have deplored the violation of international law so flagrantly perpetrated in this case. Authors and columnists William F. Buckley, Jr., John Chamberlain, John Dos Passos, Eugene Lyons, William A. Rusher, George S. Schuyler, Ralph de Toledano, and Max Yergan are also listed as protesting the kidnapping.

An appeal to intercede in Tshombe's behalf was also sent to U.N. Secretary General U Thant and President Johnson by a group of distinguished international lawyers including Arthur H. Dean, chief U.S. delegate to various international disarmament conferences; Profs. Myres S. McDougal and Harold Laswell, of Yale University; Prof. Richard A. Falk of Princeton University; Herman Phleger, former U.S. member of the Permanent International Court of Arbitration under The Hague Treaties.

The Tshombe Emergency Committee, located at 79 Madison Avenue, New York City, has collected the names of Congressmen, clergymen, educators, military men, and others who are joining the protest.

As in the case of those who have already placed themselves on record calling for fair play for Tshombe, it is imperative that others who oppose this unlawful treatment of Tshombe make their sentiments known.

For background on the Tshombe affair, I include the Washington Report of July 31 of the American Security Council, a highly respected organization which reports on national and international developments affecting the Nation's security for its over 3,500 member companies and institutions, in the RECORD at this point:

TSHOMBE AND THE CONGO STORY

(By Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren)

(Editor's Note.—Guest Editor Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren is Professor of Political Science at Le Moyne College. He has just completed a biography of Moïse Tshombe.)

The life of Moïse Tshombe hangs in the balance. Kidnapped by an agent of Congolese dictator Mobutu and handed over to Mobutu by fellow dictator Boumedienne of Algeria, Tshombe, who has been in many tight situations before, faces his gravest hour. It was reported that President Johnson, whose recent airlift in support of the Mobutu Government was cited by Congolese officials as "one of the principal reasons" why the pro-Tshombe uprisings in Kisangani and Bukavu were put down, had decided to intercede privately with Mobutu to save Tshombe's life. It was understood that the appeal to Mobutu will not be made unless the execution appears imminent. But the latter, upon learning of the decision of the Algerian Government to extradite Tshombe (even though there is no extradition treaty between the two countries—not even diplomatic relations) declared that "for us (Tshombe) is a dead man."

Moïse Tshombe is an unusual African. He is a man of the West, even though the West has, on several occasions, betrayed him. He realizes that the Congo can never make progress without an interregnum of assist-

ance from Europeans because there are so few trained Congolese administrators. David Halberstam described Tshombe as "first and foremost a conservative,"¹ having in mind, I suppose, Tshombe's Christian faith, natural caution, and anti-Communist convictions. Yet this same Tshombe took risks and exhibited extraordinary courage when confronted with almost impossible odds. He is above all an enlightened African who understands the shortcomings of his own people and is willing to learn from the West.

During a short visit to the United States in 1959, under a State Department leadership exchange program, Alan P. Merriam described Tshombe as a "pleasant, soft-spoken, and highly reasonable and intelligent person whose outlook is basically cautious and whose actions are taken only after deliberation. It seems clear that he relies heavily on Belgian advisers, but that at the same time probably makes his own decisions."²

Tshombe became Premier of the Congo on July 10, 1964; he was in the midst of preparations for national elections when, on October 13, 1965, he was ousted from office, first by President Kasavubu, and then by the coup of General Mobutu.

Under the leadership of General Mobutu, the Congo has steadily declined. After the palace revolution which forced Moïse Tshombe out of office, Parliament was dissolved and a dictatorship established. There was not a word of protest from the United States which meantime claimed that the Government of Rhodesia constituted a threat to world peace. In July 1966, on the sixth anniversary of Congolese "independence," General Mobutu described the late Patrice Lumumba as a "national hero" and declared: "I have taken up the mantle of Lumumba." He also declared war on the "money powers" and promised to rid the Congo of "economic colonialism." The General has been as good as his word. His Government has moved to re-establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet bloc; it has closed down Western consulates throughout the interior, and severed ties with Portugal. Most inflammatory of all, it has allowed the Congo to serve as a staging area for destructive Communist-inspired terrorist raids against Portuguese Angola.

On March 13, 1967, Moïse Tshombe was sentenced to death in absentia by a three-man special military court appointed by Mobutu. He was charged with high treason, subversive propaganda, inciting and organizing rebellion and recruiting foreign mercenaries for use against Mobutu.

The "trial" was adjourned after four hours. There was no defense and the public prosecutor had his summation ready immediately after the tribunal had completed its cross examination. It took 15 minutes for the tribunal to reach its verdict. That night, in Madrid, Tshombe said of the death sentence passed on him: "A verdict arrived at in ten minutes can hardly be considered a just one."

On Friday, June 30th, Moïse Tshombe left his Madrid apartment for the airport. He left Madrid aboard a chartered British twin-jet plane bound for the Spanish island of Ibiza (of the Balearic group). The pilot and copilot were British, and there were seven passengers: Tshombe, two Spanish policemen assigned as his bodyguard, three Belgians—Marcel Humberstin, Tshombe's longtime close friend and adviser; Charles Sigal, a disbarred lawyer who was promoting a real estate deal, and Sigal's wife Ivonne,—and a Frenchman, Francis Bodenan of Paris.

After touching down briefly at Ibiza, the

plane took off for Palma de Majorca, 75 miles away. Ten minutes after take-off the British pilot Captain David Taylor, radioed the Ibiza tower that he was being forced at gunpoint to fly the plane to Algeria. When the hijackers struck, several shots were fired, but only one aboard was wounded. According to informed sources, the kidnappers surprised and overwhelmed Tshombe, the two bodyguards and the two pilots. The pilot was forced at gunpoint to ask authorization to land at the Maison Blanche airport of Algiers. He was directed, instead, to Boufarik Air Base, 25 miles southwest of the Algerian capital. Upon landing, the crew and passengers were held incommunicado by Algerian security officers.

The government-controlled newspaper *El Moudjahid* said the Frenchman on board the plane, Francis Bodenan, engineered the kidnapping. It said one of the Belgians on board, Marcel Humberstin, was wounded trying to disarm Bodenan. Bodenan was remembered in Paris for his involvement in the murders of two French businessmen.

The kidnappers presumably expected that the leftist government of Algeria, posing as the vanguard of Africa's struggle against "imperialism," could not very well reject the demand of the Congolese Government for Tshombe's extradition. Shortly after the Algerian Government confirmed Spanish charges of the Tshombe kidnapping and arrival in Algeria, General Mobutu ordered a national rejoicing and dispatched a delegation headed by Attorney General Aïdior Kabeya to Algeria to seek Tshombe's extradition.

If Mobutu thought the kidnapping could be pulled off without international consequences, he was seriously mistaken. On July 5th, Congolese army units sympathetic to Tshombe rebelled in Kisangani and Bukavu. The Kisangani rebels, led by French Colonel Robert Denard, were joined by paratroops from outside the country, according to Mobutu's Congolese radio. Whether true or not, the main effort was made by dissident forces already stationed in both cities.

By July 8th, Government forces regained control of Bukavu, but the Tshombe forces for a time retained control of parts of Kisangani, including the airport. Diplomatic and Red Cross officials at the border town of Kamembe (Rwanda) reported atrocities in Bukavu by Congolese Government troops, as revenge for the uprising. According to refugee sources, many Europeans were attacked, as were Congolese suspected of pro-Tshombe sympathies.

The same day that a Congolese protest was made to the UN (about an alleged "mercenary" invasion), an American group of writers, called the Tshombe Emergency Committee, (and including Dr. Sidney Hook, Eugene Lyons and John Dos Passos) sent the following telegram to Algerian Premier Boumedienne:

"All people who believe that observance of international law is one means of achieving world peace and security are greatly concerned over the abduction of Moïse Tshombe and his detention by Algerian authorities. The abduction itself is an act of piracy which must be considered illegal under all civilized systems of law. The detention of Mr. Tshombe, who has broken no Algerian law and has been brought into your country against his will, is both contrary to accepted precepts of international law and the right of asylum. For the Government of Algeria to participate in or condone an act of piracy and kidnapping is to set a dangerous precedent in international behavior and to lower Algeria's standing in the community of nations. We earnestly believe that the undersigned American citizens represent the thinking of the American people and people throughout the world when we urgently request the Government of Algeria to immediately release Moïse Tshombe from cus-

¹ David Halberstam, "Mystery and Tragedy of Tshombe," *New York Times Magazine*, August 12, 1962, p. 7.

² Alan P. Merriam, *Congo: Background of Conflict* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1961), p. 136.

-H 10132

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 8, 1967

today and permit him to leave your country for whatever destination he may voluntarily choose. At the same time we urge your Government to insure the safety of Mr. Tshombe so long as he remains on Algerian territory and until that moment when he leaves. By so doing, the Government of Algeria will prove that it continues to respect international law and human decency."

But the Algerian Government on July 21 announced it would send Tshombe to an almost certain death in Kinshasa.

The United States has a long standing interest in the Congo and in its leaders. The first atomic bomb was constructed with uranium from the Congo. We have intervened three times in support of the central government—in 1961-1963 to support the neutralist regime of Adoula against the Katangan separatist movement; in 1964 to support the Tshombe Government against Communist-led terrorists who murdered hundreds of Europeans and Americans in the Stanleyville (now Kisangani) area, and with the airlift of July 1967 in support of Mobutu to crush the pro-Tshombe uprising led by Colonel Robert Denard and Major Jean Schramme (mercenaries in the employ of Mobutu who were outraged at the Tshombe kidnapping and rebelled to demonstrate their solidarity with the former Premier).

We have a stake in the Congo, whose central position in Africa makes it a prize in the global struggle. Neutralist regimes in surrounding Sudan, Congo (the former French colony), Uganda and Tanzania (facing the Congo across Lake Tanganyika), with Soviet support, are determined to revenge the defeat of the Lumumbist forces in 1960. Unfortunately, from the point of view of the Free World, General Mobutu appears to be following the Lumumbist line.

Tshombe was the one Congolese leader who provided stability, leadership against the neutralist-Communist coalition, preparation for constitutionalism, and friendship for the West. There are few such men in Africa. We owe it to him, to the Congolese people and to ourselves and the long-term interest of the Free World to do whatever can be done to save his life.

Aliens OUR IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

(Mr. BUTTON (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, recently I have grown increasingly alarmed, as have many of my distinguished colleagues, over an apparently inadvertent injustice of our present immigration system. I call to attention specifically section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. I remember the high expectations I shared with those who eagerly watched the 89th Congress correct inequities which had been perpetrated for so long by the old law. There is no question that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 did represent a major reevaluation of thinking and constituted a substantial advancement toward a facilitation of immigration to this country. But in its implementation appeared a great disappointment.

Under the old law aliens who wished to become citizens of the United States and entered our skilled and unskilled labor force could do so if they were within the quota assigned to their nationality, unless the Secretary of Labor certified to both the Attorney General and the Secretary of State that "there are available

in the United States at the alien's proposed destination sufficient workers able, willing and qualified at the time of application for a visa and for admission to the United States, to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, or (B) the employment of such aliens will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed."

Under the new section 212(a)(14), however, this burden of proof was shifted to the alien who was to be informed that, unless he could obtain entry permission in the form of a labor certification from the Secretary of Labor, a long and arduous bureaucratic process, he would not be welcome in America.

To my mind, this regrettable provision is contrary to the very principles upon which our free democracy was founded. At the base of the Statue of Liberty is inscribed: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." Our greatness is built upon the free choice of immigrants who came to America to apply their own free choosing and thereby help build our great Nation. Section 212(a)(14) constitutes an unnecessary harassment to many of those who would choose to make America their home. The protection to American workers that section 212(a)(14) allegedly offers is superfluous in light of the admittedly small impact which immigrants have on the national work force.

Mr. Speaker, this shift of labor certification responsibility is not a mere technicality of wording, but in actual practice has created a dire inequity in the immigration process. All aliens who seek admission to the United States to perform skilled and unskilled labor must contend with section 212(a)(14), but it has adversely affected Irish immigration the most.

Quite naturally this discriminatory result has raised much concern among our Irish American community. In May of this year the American Board Convention of the Gaelic Athletic Association joined with the American Irish Immigration Committee of New York and the growing list of Irish organizations protesting the inequity of the present immigration law, by submitting to me the following resolution:

Whereas: The American Board of the Gaelic Athletic recognizes that the former Immigration Law was biased against certain foreign nationalities and the legislation to correct the imbalance was justifiable.

Whereas: The new immigration law, now in effect, discriminates against certain nationalities most notably the Irish whose per capita contribution to the development of the United States is without parallel in its history.

Whereas: Despite the fact that immigration into the United States increased by 23,677 in 1966 over 1965, the monthly average from Ireland decreased by 78%, which means that the Irish are virtually banned from permanent residence in the United States.

Whereas: From the lips of Washington and Lincoln the Irish drew praise for their heroic valor and sacrifices against the enemy from within, so too have the Irish of America contributed to the cause of freedom against the enemy from without, as personified in the person of the most illustrious Irishman of all John F. Kennedy.

Resolved: That the American Board of the

Gaelic Athletic Association representing all clubs in twenty four cities from coast to coast in the United States call upon all Senators and Congressmen to modify the present Immigration Law as it pertains to Ireland, so that the contribution of the Irish may continue to be available to meet the New Frontiers of the future as effectively as they established the beach heads of freedom in the past.

Irish immigrants to this country have indeed contributed to America far out of proportion to their numbers. In the words of John F. Kennedy, "they have been among the best citizens." When our late President visited Ireland, his ancestral home in 1963, he stated with pride that:

The Speaker of the House is of Irish descent. The leader of the Senate is of Irish descent. . . . In Ireland I think you see something of what is so great about the United States; and I must say that in United States, through millions of your sons and daughters and cousins—25 million, in fact, you see something of what is so great about Ireland.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we sadly sustain a policy which drastically discriminates against a people who have been an integral part of our national heritage. The facts are so clear that we can no longer ignore the inequity.

In a study dated April 7, 1967, and addressed to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], Robert P. Chalker, Chargé d'Affaires ad Interim in our Embassy in Dublin, confirmed that the number of immigrant visas granted to Irishmen declined from 4,617 in 1964 and 4,004 in 1965 to 1,741 in 1966, Mr. Chalker stated:

There is no doubt that Section 212(a)(14) of the act has caused a decrease in Irish immigration to the United States. As many Irish visa applications are unskilled or semi-skilled workers, they are unable to qualify under Section 212(a)(14) as amended.

The American Embassy in Ireland anticipated the negative effects of the new section. The study points out:

In November, 1965, there was an artificial inflation of immigration visa issuance due to an all-out effort by this office to issue as many visas as possible before December 1, 1965, since many applications would not qualify under section 213(a)(14) after this date.

The concentrated efforts of our Embassy staff in Dublin are highly commendable. But now that those anticipated results have been verified, it is incumbent upon us to rectify this situation.

I, therefore, now join with several of my colleagues and introduce an amendment to the present Immigration and Nationality Act striking from it section 212(a)(14) and returning the responsibility of labor certification to the Secretary of Labor.

This bill will not only be fairer to immigrants of all nationalities, but will also restore more flexibility to the existing law's definition of skilled labor.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to correct the inequity which section 212(a)(14) has established, we will fail to serve in the best interests of the United States. We must act now to improve this law where improvement is sorely needed.

August 8, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 10133

COOPERATION AND RESPONSIBLE ACTION BY AUTHORITIES IN DELAWARE

(Mr. ROTH (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in these days of increasing rioting and violence, with individuals and groups pointing an accusing finger at each other, I point with pride and call our colleagues' attention to the manner in which public officials, law enforcement authorities and a responsible citizenry have acted in unison and with responsible cooperation in the First State of Delaware.

In recent weeks, Wilmington, like other great cities, has been threatened with outbursts of violence. Law and order have, however, been maintained by the prompt, firm action and by the solid cooperation of State and local authorities. I congratulate the Governor of Delaware, Charles L. Terry, who last week, before a special session of the Delaware General Assembly, made it clear that a breakdown of law and order in the State would not be tolerated.

The general assembly, with its able leadership and membership, acted swiftly in granting the Governor authority to deal with any civil emergency. The emergency laws it passed included an Anti-riot Act, Antifirebomb Act, and State of Emergency Act—the latter providing the Governor with power to declare a state of emergency and impose a curfew on the entire State or any part of it.

I would also like to point out the efforts of the elected officials, public safety officials and law enforcement authorities in the city of Wilmington and surrounding New Castle County, as well as the commendable efforts of the State attorney general, Delaware National Guard, State and city police, and responsible citizens' organizations.

Mr. Speaker, many of the elected officials of Delaware are of a different political party from myself and from each other. But rather than wait to point an accusing finger, they have acted promptly and responsibly in the face of this emergency.

Perhaps the reason accusing fingers are so often pointed after calamitous rioting is that there is not enough cooperative effort to cause prideful pointing before.

I am happy to say that responsible Delawareans of all races have cooperated with State and local authorities to insure that law and order is maintained. Every citizen has an obligation to seek the maintenance of peace, and the right to expect it. Any who would violate the law must be dealt with firmly under the law. The maintenance of order and peace is only one step, but it is a most important step, for without it progress is not possible in making our cities and communities better places in which all citizens can live and work.

As Americans, we have cast the framework of our society in the idea that no free government can survive that is not based on the supremacy of law; that where law ends tyranny begins; and that law alone can give us freedom.

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KUPFERMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CRISIS IN MINK INDUSTRY

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, as each day passes, the mink industry draws closer and closer to the point of collapse. In May of this year, I urged my colleagues to not only recognize the plight of the mink rancher, but to also note that this industry has never asked for—or received—financial assistance from the Federal Government. They have developed their own markets without any Federal price support assistance at all. The mink ranchers are among the most self-reliant farmers or ranchers in the United States.

All that I ask for this industrious group of mink ranchers is merely protection for their industry from duty-free mink imports, which are crippling their markets. Last May, I stated that immediate action on the part of President Johnson was urgently needed. August is here, nothing has been done on the executive level, and the situation is more critical than ever before.

Mr. William M. Roth, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, has claimed that the U.S. mink industry has had extraordinary protection for more than 15 years due to the embargo of mink from the Soviet Union. Mr. Roth's claim that the mink industry is being given maximum protection of its markets, however, has proven to be unacceptable. I include Mr. Roth's letter to me, and an outstanding reply to its content by Mr. Melvin R. Hansche, executive secretary of the Emba Mink Breeders Association, in the RECORD.

I have today written to the President urging that he peruse the additional material Mr. Hansche has sent to me.

The material referred to follows:

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, June 22, 1967.

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: Thank you for your letter of June 12 with further reference to the matter of mink imports.

I assure you that my letter of June 8 should not be construed as indicating a lack of concern for the mink industry. However, without more information the Administration does not have a basis for a decision on the imposition of additional import restrictions. As I pointed out in my earlier letter, under section 332(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, the Ways and Means Committee or the House of Representatives may ask the Tariff Commission to make a study of the problem.

Any decision as to administrative relief for the mink industry would have to be made

by the President himself on the basis of the best possible information. It has been suggested to us, for example, that the President use his authority under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, to negotiate agreements with foreign countries to limit their mink exports to the United States. We have carefully considered this suggestion and have concluded that more information would be needed in order to evaluate the advisability of using this procedure. It seems clear that other countries could not reasonably be expected to give serious consideration to agreeing to limit their mink exports to the United States in the absence of data demonstrating convincingly that it was necessary to curtail shipments of mink from foreign countries because of the situation in the domestic mink industry. For this reason, I believe the President would not be inclined to ask other countries to enter into negotiations unless there had been a showing, as a result of a careful investigation, that such agreement was necessary.

As to the extraordinary protection which the mink industry has had since 1951, I can only point out that the provision which prohibits the importation of mink from the Soviet Union applies only to six other specified types of furs and to no other products whatsoever. For this reason, the protection which the mink industry has had for more than 15 years must be regarded as extraordinary.

Since I wrote you earlier this month, we have learned from the American Embassy in Copenhagen that mink breeders in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland, like their counterparts in the United States, are disturbed over the declining prices for their mink pelts and have decided to take drastic steps to counteract the downward trend. At a recent meeting in Stockholm, the association of mink breeders in the four Scandinavian countries agreed to reduce mink production by 30 percent.

The Embassy reports that for Denmark alone this will mean that between 600,000 and 700,000 newborn mink cubs of the standard type will be killed during the coming months. It is planned that the destruction of mink cubs will continue until prices have been brought back to what the breeders regard as the normal level. According to the Embassy, the Scandinavian fur breeders consider that the present low price level is due to oversupply and, therefore, consider it reasonable to respond by reducing the supplies of mink pelts.

The four Scandinavian countries are the major source of United States imports of mink. The 30-percent reduction in their mink production should therefore help relieve the downward pressure on mink prices in this country to the benefit of United States mink breeders.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ROTH,
Special Representative.

EMBA MINK BREEDERS ASSOCIATION,
Racine, Wisc., July 25, 1967.

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: With reference to your request of July 13, 1967 for further evidence to support our contention that the mink farmers of the United States are in desperate straits and need help immediately, we give you the following information:

Because of economic conditions in our industry, the Emba Mink Breeders Association membership has dropped from a peak of 5,623 in 1953 to a low of 3,460 at the end of 1966. A large percentage of this number quit because they could not survive financially.

Following is a graph showing comparisons by the month of our 1966-67 selling seasons:

H10134

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 8, 1967

	1966		
	Offered	Percent sold	Average
December 1965.....	136,325	83	\$18.20
January 1966.....	814,997	93	22.45
February 1966.....	1,131,688	93	21.25
April 1966.....	925,579	94	18.06
May 1966.....	736,402	88	17.86
June 1966.....	275,265	78	13.80

	1967			Percent of drop
	Offered	Percent sold	Average	
December 1966.....	145,000	48	\$15.99	12
January 1967.....	718,807	66	16.75	25
February 1967.....	1,206,564	77	17.39	18
April 1967.....	1,051,480	68	13.74	24
May 1967.....	1,014,921	77	12.84	28
June 1967.....	885,300	66	10.32	25

The Emba average to date this year, is \$14.63 gross to the mink farmer.

The following selling costs are incurred before the farmer receives his check:

1967 average gross to date..... \$14.63

Dressing	1.50
Auction company commission (5¼ % of \$14.63)77
Association assessment for advertising and promotion.....	.26
Total	2.53
Balance	12.10

This net average receipt of \$12.10 is considerably below the average cost of production.

In many cases, the auction companies inform us that the net sales of the farmers' pelts will not cover the advances they have made against the pelts. It would seem obvious to any interested person to assume that those ranchers in this financial bind cannot get financing for this year's crop of pelts.

As we had predicted, reports are now coming in where farmers are offering their present kit crop for sale as low as \$1.00 per kit. What alternative do they have, when they cannot get the money to buy feed?

The June 1967 average gross sales price of \$10.30 is the first time in our history when any month's average has fallen below \$12.00.

Never before has the association had such a large quantity of unsold pelts at this time of the year. Usually we are 99% sold out by now. This year we still have between 300,000 and 400,000 unsold pelts, all of which have been offered at least once at auction and have been bought back because of low bids, or no bids at all.

This quantity of unsold pelts obviously adds to our problems, in that it is highly probable that we will face the 1967 pelting season with a carry-over of unsold goods from the 1966 crop.

In Mr. Roth's letter to you he mentions the extraordinary protection the mink ranchers of the United States are receiving thru the embargo of Russian mink. It might be well to remind all concerned that even with the embargo, there is a steady stream of Russian mink coming into this country, via other countries. This is an admitted fact, even by our customs officials in New York City with whom I discussed this problem personally.

Referring again to Mr. Roth's letter where he states that the four Scandinavian countries are reducing their kit crop by 30%—reports of intentions compared with final actions many times are vastly different. Even if their intentions were, or are being carried out, if you start out with an increase of about 25% females held over from last year, and assuming normal production, and 25% of the kits are destroyed, you still end up

with the same disastrous quantities of last year. What progress has been made?

Therefore Mr. Roth's argument that this should relieve the pressure sufficiently so that we do not need the help of import quotas is not a sound deduction. It only shows that prospects for the next season will be no better than the disastrous one through which we are trying to struggle.

From past experience, we must conclude that since the Scandinavian countries have an outlet to dump their excess pelts for free, and that since their cost of production is lower than ours, there is no real incentive for them to cut their production until they have eliminated their competition in the United States.

We all recognize who has the ability to help us in our plight. But ability alone is worthless without a willingness to help. A combination of the two will shed a ray of hope on an industry about to go under.

Thank you again for your efforts in behalf of the mink rancher.

Cordially,

MELVIN R. HANSCHKE,
Executive Secretary.

DON'T BLAME CRIME ON POLICE

(Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, during the debate in the House on the bill designed to assist in the serious business of finding solutions to reduce crime, it is important to pay attention to the words of the most respected law enforcement officer in the world, J. Edgar Hoover.

The following message from Director Hoover appears in the August 1, 1967, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, and should be studied by all persons interested in solving the most serious of all domestic problems.

The message follows:

Often we hear the charge that law enforcement lives in a world of its own, out of touch with reality and the mainstream of our society. This is a baseless charge and should be refuted each time it is heard.

The truth is that law enforcement, by the very nature of its responsibilities, is in much closer touch with the public than are most other professions. The officer on the beat, the patrolman in the cruiser, and the sergeant at the desk know far more about people and what they are thinking than do the sophisticated theorists who issue "authoritative" appraisals of criminality from within ivory-tower offices.

It has also been suggested that law enforcement remains dormant while other professions forge ahead to new realms of achievement and growth. Some critics say that law enforcement is satisfied to mark time, insulate itself from change, and turn its back on progress. They imply that law enforcement is largely responsible for the Nation's crime problem. This may be an easy hypothesis to accept if a person is looking for a scapegoat. However, it is an erroneous conclusion, and it reflects the shallow reasoning of some who have little, if any, practical experience in or knowledge of enforcing the law.

For years, responsible law enforcement leaders have been waging a relentless, although often futile, battle to modernize and professionalize law enforcement. Their pleas, warnings, and exhortations for the most part have fallen on deaf ears. Only recently has the voice of law enforcement received any appreciable recognition—and this has come about mainly because crime has reached such

proportions that it can no longer be ignored if our Nation is to survive.

The annals of law enforcement are replete with examples of achievements which show that progressive, effective enforcement, keyed to human relations, has been a continuing goal of career officials. While struggling without adequate funds and without public support, law enforcement has always been receptive to, and where possible has applied, all scientific developments and technological breakthroughs which would enable it to do a better job and to improve its standards.

Police officials know from experience that crime prevention and enforcement of the law are a bit more complicated than the supervision of a church picnic. Sociological dreamers notwithstanding, crime cannot be explained away. It can be given aliases, but by any other name it is still crime—violations of the laws of our land. And it is still increasing.

It is not surprising, therefore, to note that many who in the past chose to minimize the danger of crime and to ignore police pleas for help now quite charitably choose to place much of the blame for soaring criminality at the door of law enforcement. While law enforcement has its shortcomings, to charge that it is by choice out of step with progress is an admission of ignorance.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, Director.

(Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. GOODELL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DETROIT RIOTS

(Mr. LLOYD (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about politics being played in connection with the Detroit riot. Certainly newsmen who were on the scene are well equipped to comment on the extent to which politics may have entered into the actions of various individuals involved. I believe, therefore, that all Members of the House will be interested in a Detroit News editorial of July 30. I urge that all House Members read this editorial statement, which follows:

L. B. J. ON URBAN RIOTS—STILL PLAYING POLITICS

There was much more to commend in President Johnson's message to the nation Thursday night on the recent wave of riots than in his TV speech announcing his decision to send Army units into riot-torn Detroit. Yet the political overtones that had marked his first speech still echoed in the second.

In effect, Mr. Johnson sought to pin at least part of the blame for the riots in Detroit and other American cities on those members of Congress who opposed social legislation to combat the conditions that breed despair and violence in our big cities. This effort, in this newspaper's opinion, was unfair.

It is true that in the long run the model cities program, new housing legislation, a broadened Head Start program to aid underprivileged school children and other social legislation should alleviate the conditions that cause trouble in the big cities of America. But they won't do much overnight. The job simply is too big. And so it is non-